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INTRODUCTION

The fundamental purpose of park master planning is to provide a framework for the development of park and recreation facilities in the City of Indianapolis and Marion County. The master plans that result from this process reflect both the physical aspects of the proposed park site and the identified needs of the potential park users. Individual master plans vary with respect to the size and complexity of the park. Obviously, a neighborhood park master plan will require a less stringent physical analysis than a large regional park such as Eagle Creek Park.

The five regional parks in Marion County are established as recreational facilities that supplement the neighborhood and community parks. These facilities are typically oriented toward the natural environment, and are developed in order to provide recreational facilities not found in the neighborhood and community parks. They are also intended to be easily accessible from several communities.
HISTORY OF PARK DEVELOPMENT

CREATION OF RESERVOIR

The Eagle Creek Reservoir was created as a result of the need to control flooding on the Big Eagle Creek, a tributary of the White River. To this end, an earthen dam was constructed approximately 700 feet upstream from Interstate 74 (I-74) which resulted in a reservoir of 1383 acres of surface water. Construction on the dam began in 1965 and was completed in 1969. Concurrent to this desire to control flooding, it was observed by the Marion County Board of Park Commissioners that an opportunity to create needed public park space was presented. As a result, additional properties in Pike Township owned by Purdue University were purchased in 1965.

The reservoir, the creation of a large public park, planned sewer installations, and the completion of the interstate system all combined to act as catalysts of growth on the private lands in the vicinity of the reservoir. The Metropolitan Planning Commission and the Board of Park Commissioners recognized the implications of the forces at work, and commissioned preparation of a master plan for the area to assist in the orderly development of the Eagle Creek Reservoir area. This planning area was bounded by I-74 on the south, I-465 on the east, I-65 on the north, and the county line on the west. Included within this area was the Eagle Creek Reservoir, Eagle Creek Park, and privately held land which would be designated as a planned unit development (PUD).

ORIGINAL MASTER PLAN (1969)

The original Eagle Creek Master Plan was completed in 1969. This initial plan was a comprehensive work that presented policies and proposals that addressed the use of the reservoir and the planning area. The official resolution governing the use of the water area was contained in the planning report and addressed issues covering recreation uses. Suggestions for further public acquisition of land to protect the reservoir and to complement existing park land were made.

Transportation development standards were also recommended for the planning area. These included primary arterials, secondary arterials, park roads, and pedestrian ways.

One of the most important features of the plan was the land use proposals for both public and private land. The proposed development within the park (north and south of 56th Street) was based upon an in-park capacity of 31,700 persons on a peak day, and a total yearly peak day attendance of nearly 2,500,000 with projected revenues of $618,600 (excluding concession revenues). The area south of 56th Street, east of the reservoir, west of I-465, and north of I-74 was proposed as a planned unit development (PUD) that would accommodate 24,000 residents and 10,000 housing units. The proposals and recommendations covering the park lands were organized into four development phases.
MASTER PLAN UPDATES

The first update of the Eagle Creek Master Plan was completed in 1974. Because the original plan had not been strictly adhered to, specifically with regard to the proposed land acquisitions, the 1974 update set out to re-establish and reinforce the original planning design concepts. Because there had not been a considerable amount of development in the Eagle Creek area, the possibility of establishing the guidelines necessary for the creation of the major regional park facility and the complete planned unit development (PUD) were greatly enhanced.

This updated master plan:
1) Provided written descriptions and graphics showing public policy changes that affect the transportation system and the Land Use Plan set forth in the original Eagle Creek Master Plan,

2) Provided interpretation of the public policy changes that had occurred since the 1969 adoption of the original plan,

3) Provided a graphic means of calculating specific unit intensities for different land areas in the planned unit development area,

4) Provided detailed residential intensities as to enable a more accurate count of the minimum and maximum land use intensity in the planned unit development area, and

5) Provided a more specific layout and written description of Eagle Creek Park, based on public policy changes.

In 1978, the master plan was updated to reflect changes in Eagle Creek Park. The planned unit development remained unchanged. Most of those changes noted in the master plan simply identified the relocation of facilities that had appeared on the previous master plans.

The 1985 master plan update will reflect modifications that have been made to the park since 1978 (i.e., modifications not shown on the 1978 plan) and propose the upgrading and installation of facilities in anticipation of increased recreational demand.
PROCESS

INTRODUCTION

The development of this master plan (Fig. 1) represents the efforts of many people. The Eagle Creek Advisory Committee is responsible for the major background work which led to the development of many recommendations. Technical assistance provided by Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) and Department of Metropolitan Development (DMD) staff members helped to shape these recommendations into preliminary proposals. These proposals were then subjected to many levels of review and comment, which ultimately resulted in this final plan.

PRE-PROGRAM DATA COLLECTION

Service Area

The 1981 UPARR Action Plan states that the service area for a regional park is several communities. There are 15 park planning communities in Marion County. The actual service area for Eagle Creek Park, however, is more complex than is suggested by the political boundaries of Pike Township, Marion County, or the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA).

According to a 1983 park user survey, 71.2% of the visitors came from Marion County and 28.8% of the visitors came from out of the county (TABLE 1). A closer look at the various Townships indicates that people living primarily in the northwest quadrant of the county were the most frequent users. However, it should be noted that the data does not present the populations as a percentage of the total population in each township. For example, Pike Township represents only 8.9% of the park visitors. This would seem unusually low since the park is located in Pike Township, but only 3.3% of the county's population lives in Pike Township. Therefore, this data should, at best, be used to suggest that visitors do come from all over the county.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>% of Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington Township</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Township</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Township</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike Township</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Township</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur Township</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Township</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Township</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Township</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of County</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adjusted to reflect only the nine townships as the sample population. i.e., disregarding the "out of county" visitors.
Figure 1
It is felt that since 71.2% of the park visitors come from throughout Marion County, this population will sufficiently represent the needs and interests of the users of this park. Therefore, Marion County is designated as the service area for the development of this master plan.

Census Data

This census information (TABLE 2) represents the service area (Marion County) as well as the SMSA and townships in Hendricks and Boone counties adjacent to Pike Township.

The most significant conclusion which can be drawn from this census data comes from the information about age groups. As can be seen, the population is steadily growing older. The decline in the number of younger children is followed by a decline in the demand for neighborhood parks. That is, parks that are designed to meet the needs of the population groups with a limited geographic range. In response to this decline in demand, there will be an accompanying increase in the demand for larger community and regional parks. The basic assumption is that as the population grows older, it becomes more mobile. This greater mobility indicates that the larger recreational facilities will become more accessible to a greater number of people. As a result, recreation planners should place an increasing emphasis on the controlled development of these regional facilities.

| TABLE 2 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| ![](image) | ![](image) | ![](image) | ![](image) |
| Marion Co. plus Clay, Worth, Perry, Eagle, Brown and Lincoln Townships* | Marion County |
| SMSA | 825,883 | 765,233 |
| 1980 Population | 1,166,575 | 1,054,908 (+10.6%) | 832,083 (-7.5%) | 792,299 (-3.4%) |
| Projected 1990 Population | 1,254,100 | NA | 748,800 |
| (Change from 1980) | +7.5% | NA | -2.15% |
| 0-5 | 11.0% | 9.0% | 11.0% | 8.9% |
| 6-17 | 25.4% | 20.6% | -16.7% | -6.1% |
| 18-21 | 6.1% | 7.0% | +20.8% | 7.5% |
| 22-44 | 29.4% | 34.3% | +22.8% | 35.7% |
| 45-54 | 11.2% | 10.3% | -4.0% | 10.4% |
| 55+ | 16.9% | 18.9% | +17.0% | 19.5% |
| Population density | 378.3/square mile | 1,566.5/square mile | 1,903.56/square mile |
| Persons per Family | 3.29 | 3.37 | 3.26 |
| % Population in Family Households | 87% | 85.3% | 84.6% |
| Median Household Income | $21,750 | NA | $20,819 |
| % High School Graduates | 69.3% | NA | 67.5% |
| % College Graduates | 15.9% | NA | 16.3% |

*Clay is in Hamilton County; Eagle, Perry, and Worth are in Boone County; Brown and Lincoln are in Hendricks County.
Existing Recreational Facilities

The Indianapolis parks system includes five parks designated as "regional parks." Table 3 lists the regional parks and an inventory of the facilities in each of them. Figure 2 shows the location of each of these parks within Marion County.

### TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL PARK RECREATION FACILITIES</th>
<th>EADE GREEN</th>
<th>EAGLE GREEN</th>
<th>JAY HOLLAND</th>
<th>MARVIN HILL</th>
<th>PORTAGE</th>
<th>SOUTHWEST WAY</th>
<th>SOUTHEAST WAY</th>
<th>RIVERSIDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINTENANCE BUILDINGS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISHING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALL DIAMONDS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASKETBALL COURTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNIS COURTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDS PLAY AREAS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD SPORTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICNIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHELTERS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN AREAS</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAILS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURE STUDY AREAS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODS</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL WATER FEATURES</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCESSION Foothold</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST ROOMS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWIMMING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLF COURSE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINTER SPORTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HISTORIC FEATURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HISTORIC FEATURES</th>
<th>おりがい skate</th>
<th>ソフトライト</th>
<th>ソフトライト</th>
<th>ソフトライト</th>
<th>ソフトライト</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL FACILITIES</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW DEVEL. POTENTIAL</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNERSHIP</td>
<td>DNP</td>
<td>DPN</td>
<td>DPN</td>
<td>DPN</td>
<td>DPN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL POPULATION</td>
<td>1-10 years and younger</td>
<td>D-Elderly</td>
<td>D-Elderly</td>
<td>D-Elderly</td>
<td>D-Elderly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REMARKS

- スキームパーク:スキー、スノーボード、アイススケート
- スキーライト:夜のスキーセンター
- スキー・スノーボード・アイススケート: 冬のスポーツ・レクリエーション
- レクリエーション・スポーツ・センター
- レクリエーション・スポーツ・センター
- レクリエーション・スポーツ・センター
- レクリエーション・スポーツ・センター
- レクリエーション・スポーツ・センター
REGIONAL PARKS

1 EAGLE CREEK
2 W.S. SAHM
3 SOUTHWESTWAY
4 SOUTHEASTWAY
5 RIVERSIDE
Outdoor Recreation Trends

The Department of Metropolitan Development Park Planning staff, in assisting the Advisory Committee, compiled the following information on outdoor recreation trends. These trends pertain to local, regional, and national conditions. This information was used by the Advisory Committee to formulate its recommendations for the development of the master plan proposals.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Statistics has published a list (TABLE 4) of the most popular outdoor activities in the United States. On a national scale, this list helps to focus the concerns of outdoor recreation planners at the regional and local levels. These concerns can then be weighed against the existing leisure system to determine if a sufficient effort is being made to satisfy these needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>% of Population Who Participates</th>
<th>% of Demand Met</th>
<th>Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Picnicking</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Swimming</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fishing</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hiking</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bicycling</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Playfields</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Boating</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Camping</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tennis</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Golf</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Playgrounds</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Basketball</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hunting</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ice Skating</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sledding</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Horseback Riding</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Snow Skiing</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Eagle Creek Park and the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA), the concerns are consistent with those expressed at the national level. Table 5 lists the sixteen most popular outdoor recreation activities in the region.

Table 5

NEEDS ANALYSIS
PARTICIPATION - SUPPLY - DEMAND
INDIANAPOLIS SMSA*

*Source: 1979 Indiana State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan
The information contained in this table generally reflects the supply-demand situation in the SMSA. The statistics represent averages for the entire SMSA, thus not giving consideration to the increases in demand caused by varying population densities (e.g., Marion County's population density is greater than those areas in the outerlying portions of the SMSA). Taking this into consideration, the Advisory Committee was able to review the information and utilize that which is applicable to planning for the needs of the park users.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Committee Work

With the above-mentioned information, and the previous master plan documents, the Advisory Committee set out to make recommendations for the future development of Eagle Creek Park. The original recommendations can be reviewed at the Eagle Creek Park Administrator's office. Before developing these recommendations, however, the committee decided on some "guiding principles" which were meant to serve as policy guides. These guiding principles are as follows:

1. The present character of the park should be maintained. The 1974 master plan first recommended the preservation of this character by calling for the regional park concept. In this concept, most of the park activities are oriented towards the natural outdoor environment. It is recommended that any recreational activities development be reflective of this concept. This will hopefully insure that the park will not succumb to budgetary pressures requiring financial self-sufficiency. This pressure often results in the development of revenue producing facilities which can conflict with the natural character concept.

2. Where special recreational activities and facilities are provided with the intent of fee collection, a cost-benefit analysis should determine if the project is feasible.

3. The development of facilities should provide for maximum efficiency in long-range maintenance costs.

Park Planning Staff Work

The recommendations provided by the Advisory Committee were reviewed by the park planning staff. This staff includes representatives of the Department of Metropolitan Development, Division of Planning and the Department of Parks and Recreation. The review process included an in-depth investigation of the site characteristics (site analysis) to determine if the park site is suitable for each particular facility. The results of this process are the proposals which constitute the program.
WATERSHED

The Eagle Creek Watershed, which is a major sub-watershed of the White River Watershed, encompasses approximately 168 square miles (Fig.3). The reservoir and park lands comprise about 4.3% of the total land area within the watershed, and are located only a few miles upstream from the point of juncture between Eagle Creek and the White River.

Land use within the watershed is primarily agriculture, but residential development is steadily increasing. The residential developments are mostly low density, except around Zionsville where new development and the existing urban structure result in an overall higher density.

Siltation, which settles out in the northern section of Eagle Creek Reservoir, is the major environmental impact within the watershed. This is caused primarily by eroding agricultural lands. This problem is exacerbated by the increasing development, which results in a greater amount of erosion producing runoff. The main concern with regard to recreation development in Eagle Creek Park is to avoid activities that will add to this erosion and siltation problem.

SURROUNDING LAND USES

Eagle Creek Park is located adjacent to the Marion-Hendricks County Line. Because of this, there are two counties' land use regulations affecting the surrounding land uses.

Most of the land around the park in Marion County is very low (1-2 Dwelling Units/Acre) to low (2-5 Dwelling Units/Acre) density residential development. South of 56th Street and east of the reservoir exists small areas of higher density development and the Eagle Creek Airpark. The main concern with residential development is that the land is currently undeveloped and may eventually develop at higher densities than is currently allowed under present zoning conditions. The obvious implication is that the increase in population will place a greater demand on the facilities at Eagle Creek Park. The anticipation of this demand should help direct park policy toward the goal of preserving the natural character of the park, and therefore, shift the recreational demand to other facilities. The airport has an impact on the park primarily because of the noise generated by the aircraft.

In Hendricks County, two townships, Brown and Lincoln, abut the Eagle Creek Park property. Within the vicinity of the park, the land use in these townships is primarily agricultural with scattered residential development.
The Hendricks County Comprehensive Plan (1983) gives several reasons for the low developmental rate in the reservoir vicinity.

First, and foremost, increased development requires the extension of sewer service to the area. (It is noted that the extensive use of septic systems may present a pollution threat to the reservoir waters.) Second, the cost of extending sewer service from Brownsburg is, at present, prohibitive. And third, Marion County policy prevents the extension of sewer service outside the county's boundaries. Consequently, development in this part of Hendricks County is subjected to these limitations.

The Hendricks County plan does suggest that the two counties should work together to establish a development plan for the reservoir area.

If such a plan were established, this would provide an excellent opportunity for Marion County to insure that development in this part of Hendricks County would be responsive to the natural character preservation goals of Eagle Creek Park.

**TOPOGRAPHY**

As seen in Figure 4, the park area has an outstanding variation of topographic relief. The topography is divided basically into two areas. One area is the land included in the Eagle Creek Reservoir watershed, and the other falls in the Little Eagle Creek watershed.

On the west side of the reservoir, there are a number of ridges cresting at approximately 850 feet above sea level—about 60 feet above the reservoir permanent pool. Slopes on the sides of these ridges range from 10 to 30 percent, while the crests of these ridges generally have slopes not exceeding five percent. The crests range from 50 to 150 feet wide, and run from 100 to 1,200 feet west from the reservoir shoreline. Much of the area north of 56th Street is extremely rugged and is currently unbisected by roads. Attempts to cross this rough terrain with park roads would not only be economically unfeasible, but would destroy wildlife habitat, conservation and aesthetic qualities. Therefore, on the west side of the reservoir, and north of 56th Street, park roads should not be located near the water, but rather on the ridge crests to the west. Similar topographic conditions exist in the Shoals Creek inlet area.

Topography on the east side of the reservoir is much less varied than on the west side. In general, lands near the water are steeper than those farther away. Extensive bluffs, immediately adjacent to the water, run along the property once occupied by J.K. Lilly (from 62nd Street to 65th Street), and along the land currently being used by the Indian Museum. Because these bluffs provide magnificent views of the reservoir, the use of this area
should consider the view potential. In the vicinity of 71st Street, the lands adjacent to the permanent pool are relatively flat. The flatness of these lands, coupled with the mud flats which will occur when the permanent pool experiences drawdown, indicates that these lands should not be intensively developed. In general, slopes within 2500 feet of the water, north of 56th Street, range from 5 to 10 percent. Such grades are well suited to many forms of passive recreation. South of 56th Street, lands of 5-10 percent slope occur within 1500 feet of the shoreline. In some areas, there are extremely steep bluffs immediately adjacent to the water. Such areas provide ideal sites for scenic overlooks and small picnic areas. East of the 5 to 10 percent slopes lies land that is almost flat—less than 5% grade. Very little of this land is park property, and as a result, presents challenges only in terms of those uses that may conflict with the park (e.g. airport and residential development).

VEGETATION

The Eagle Creek park lands lie within the Beech-Maple Association of the Eastern Deciduous Forest. Although most of the original Beech-Maple climax forest has been cleared in Indiana, several remnants can be found—a few of which are located on the parklands. The locations of these remnants are as follows: 1) the steep ridges on the northwest side of the reservoir, east of the Eagles Crest, 2) the broad ridge extending west from just north of 56th Street on the west side of the reservoir, 3) the peninsula on the south side of the small inlet halfway between the Indian Museum and 56th Street on the east side, and 4) the area immediately adjacent to the Indian Museum.

Species exclusive of the Beech-Maple Association occur throughout the park area as a result of park development, environmental influences, and extensive plantings. Figure 5 shows the general vegetative cover over the entire park area. As a general rule, the steeply sloped areas are covered with dense tree canopies, and the flatter areas are covered with successional fields at various stages. Additionally, maintained turf-grass areas are found throughout the park (e.g. golf course and picnic areas).

SOILS

An investigation of the soils was undertaken to determine the suitability of land within the project area for recreation, road alignment, structural foundations, forestry, wildlife, and other amenities.

The soils studies (Fig. 6) revealed that most of the present valley of Eagle Creek must have been created by torrents of drainage water which resulted when the last glacial ice sheet melted. The valley must have been cut quickly into the mass of mineral material (sand, silt, and clay) that had been deposited directly by the ice. This depositional material is commonly referred to as glacial till.
Sixteen existing soil types occur within the project area. Cut and Fill represents a seventeenth type, but its characteristics are difficult to determine without performing on-site investigation. The 16 soil types are listed below along with the characteristics with park planning implications.

**Br** - Brookston Silt Clay Loam
Runoff is very slow; wetness is the main limitation.
Buildings: Severe (wetness)
Roads: Severe (wetness, frost action)
Recreation Development: Severe (wetness)
Wooded areas support fair stands of hardwoods, but some are heavily pastured.

**CrA** - Crosby Silt Loam, 0-2% slopes
Runoff is slow; wetness is the main limitation
Buildings: moderate (wetness, shrink-swell, low-strength)
Roads: severe (frost action)
Recreation Development: moderate (wetness, percolates slowly)
Wooded areas support fair stands of hardwoods, but some are heavily pastured.

**CsB2** - Crosby Miami Silt Loam, 2-4% slopes
Runoff is medium; moderate erosion is the main limitation.
Buildings: moderate (wetness, shrink-swell, low strength)
Roads: severe (frost action)
Recreation Development: moderate (wetness, percolates slowly)
Few wooded areas support fair stands of hardwoods.

**Ee** - Eel Silt Loam
Runoff is slow; flooding is the main limitation
Buildings: severe (floods)
Roads: severe (floods, frost action)
Recreation Development: severe-moderate (floods)
Wooded areas support poor to fair stands of hardwoods. Most areas are cultivated.

**FoB2** - Fox Loam, 2-6% slopes
Runoff is medium; moderate erosion and droughtiness are the main limitations.
Buildings: slight - moderate (slope)
Roads: moderate (shrink-swell)
Recreation Development: slight
Few wooded areas support poor to fair stands of hardwoods.

**FxC2** - Fox complex, 6-15% slopes
Runoff is medium; moderate erosion is the main limitation.
Buildings: severe-moderate (slope)
Roads: Moderate (slope, shrink-swell)
Recreation Development: moderate-severe (slope)
Few small wooded areas support poor to fair stands of hardwoods. Most areas are cultivated or in pasture.

Ge -
Genesee Silt Loam
Runoff is slow; flooding is the main limitation.
Buildings: severe (floods)
Roads: severe (floods)
Recreation Development: moderate-severe (floods)
Wooded areas support poor to fair stands of hardwoods.

HeF -
Hennepin Loam, 25-50% slopes
Runoff is very rapid. Erosion and steepness of slope are the main limitations.
Buildings: severe (slope)
Roads: severe (slope)
Recreation Development: severe (slope)
Wooded areas support fair stands of hardwoods. It is best suited to trees.

MgB2 -
Martinsville Silt Loam, 2-6% slopes
Runoff is medium, moderate erosion is the main limitation.
Buildings: slight-moderate (slope)
Roads: moderate (frost action)
Recreation Development: slight
Few wooded areas support fair stands of hardwoods.

MmB2 -
Miami Silt Loam, 2-6% slope
Runoff is medium; moderate erosion is the main limitation.
Buildings: moderate (shrink-swell, low strength)
Recreation Development: slight
Few wooded areas support poor to fair stands of hardwoods.

MmC2 -
Miami Silt Loam, 6-12% slope
Runoff is medium; moderate erosion is the main limitation.
Buildings: moderate - severe (slope, shrink-swell, low strength)
Roads: severe (low strength)
Recreation Development: slight; playgrounds-severe (slopes)
Wooded areas support poor to fair stands of hardwoods.

MxD2 -
Miami Complex, 12-18% slope
Runoff is rapid on the eroded soils and very rapid on the severely eroded soils; erosion is the main limitation.
Buildings: severe (slope)
Roads: severe (slope)
Recreation Development: severe-moderate (slope)
Wooded areas support fair stands of hardwoods.

MxE2 -
Miami complex, 18-24% slope
Runoff is rapid; slope is the main limitation.
Buildings: severe (slope)
Roads: severe (slope)
Recreation Development: severe-moderate (slope)
Most areas are wooded with fair stands of hardwoods.

OcA - Ockley Silt Loam, 0-2% slope
Runoff is slow; only slight limitations for most nonfarm uses.
Buildings: slight-moderate (shrink-swell)
Roads: moderate (frost action, low strength)
Recreation Development: slight
Wooded areas support fair stands of hardwoods.

OcB2 - Ockley Silt Loam, 2-6% slope
Runoff is medium; moderate erosion is the main limitation.
Buildings: slight-moderate (shrink-swell)
Roads: moderate (frost action, low strength)
Recreation Development: slight-moderate (slope)
Few small wooded areas support poor stands of hardwoods.

Sh - Shoals Silt Loam
Runoff is very slow; flooding and wetness are the main limitations.
Buildings: severe (floods)
Roads: severe (floods, frost action)
Recreational Development: severe-moderate (wetness, floods)
Wooded areas support poor to fair stands of hardwoods.

WILDLIFE

Wildlife on the Eagle Creek Park parklands falls into one of three basic groups: 1) game wildlife, 2) non-game wildlife, and 3) rare, endangered, and peripheral species.

1. Game wildlife includes mammals (e.g., White-Tailed Deer, Cottontail Rabbit, and Squirrels), game birds (e.g., Bobwhite Quail, and Woodcock), water fowl (e.g., Mallard and Canada Goose), and fur bearers (e.g., Beaver, Muskrat and Fox).

2. Non-game wildlife includes a variety of animals, typically smaller than the game wildlife. Birds are perhaps the most noted group of non-game wildlife. A publication, written by Alfred "Bud" Starling, indicates that at the present time, 222 different bird species have been observed at the park, and of those, 91 have been known to nest, or have been suspected of nesting, in the park area. Mammals, reptiles, amphibians, and invertebrates represent the remainder of the non-game wildlife.

3. At the present time, none of the non-migrating rare, endangered, or peripheral species found in Indiana exist at Eagle Creek Park. Additionally, only a few of the migrating species (e.g., Peregrine Falcon, Sandhill Crane, and American Osprey) have been sighted—very rarely—at Eagle Creek Park.
INTRODUCTION

The 1985 Master Plan Update for Eagle Creek Park (see enclosed map) is comprised of three basic components: 1) existing facilities, 2) proposals that were included in the 1978 plan but have not yet been implemented, and 3) proposals that were developed for this 1985 master plan update.

EXISTING FACILITIES

Following is a list of those park facilities that are in existence. These facilities are the result of previous master planning efforts. Several of these facilities will be discussed below with the new proposals.

Eagle Creek Sailing Club Marina - Shoals Creek Inlet
Dandy Trail Overlook
Dandy Trail Boat Launch and Boat Slips
Dandy Trail Marina (Beachboat Facility)
Pistol Range
Ice Skating Ponds
Swim Beach
Picnic Areas (east side of reservoir)
Boat Rental - Fishing Center
Bicycle Rentals
Lilly Lake Pedal Boat Rentals
X-C Ski Rentals and Trails
Amphitheatre
Arts and Crafts Center
Fitness Course
Environmental Education Building
Nature Center
Water Fowl Sanctuary
Wildlife Habitat Areas
Eagle's Crest
Eagle's Hide-A-Way
Golf Course (27 holes) and Clubhouse
Radio Controlled Airplane Flying Field

EXISTING PROPOSALS

The following proposals have been retained from previous master plans. They are still considered valid ideas, but have not been implemented because of their priority levels and the lack of available funds.

West Gate
Picnic Areas (west side of reservoir)
Hiking Trails (west side of reservoir)
Lodge and Cabins (west side of reservoir)
NEW PROPOSALS

The work performed by the Advisory Committee and the park planning staff led to the development of the program of proposals for this master plan update. Included in this program are fourteen proposals for new facilities and the modification/expansion or relocation of existing facilities.

1. Shelter and Concession Complex – This complex will replace an existing picnic shelter that has not been used as originally intended. The new complex will be larger, and thus capable of serving larger groups. The complex will also feature restrooms and a concession stand. It will serve the Dandy Trail Boat Launch, Boat Slips, and picnic area. The complex is conveniently located between these facilities.

2. Marina – Beachboat Facility – The existing master plan for the park (1978 up-date) shows this area designated as a marina facility with a seawall and boat slips. Because the off-shore area is extremely shallow, it is somewhat impractical to develop a seawall and boat slips. The new master plan designates this area as a beachboat facility. It is currently being successfully used as such a facility, and consequently, the plan does not propose any additional development.

3. Group Picnic Area – This proposal calls for the development of a group picnic area on the south side of the Shoals Creek Inlet. It is recognized that this area is somewhat inaccessible at the present time. The Thoroughfare Plan for Marion County proposes an interchange at I-74 and Raceway Road. The completion of this interchange will improve accessibility and thus make this area attractive for development. The completion of this interchange should precede the development of the group picnic area.

4. Neighborhood Park – This proposal calls for a neighborhood park adjacent to the Eagle Creek Sailing Club Marina. There are currently no facilities of this nature serving those residents living on the west side of the reservoir. And, as this area continues to develop, the demand for such a facility will increase. This facility should include something for all ages such as tot-lots, basketball courts, volleyball courts, playground equipment, picnic tables and benches. This park should also include restroom and drinking water facilities. Additionally, the park will not be enclosed within the Eagle Creek Park boundaries.

5. Golf Course Expansion/Picnic Area – The master plan proposes to adjust the location of the picnic area to allow for the potential golf course expansion in the open field immediately north of the present golf course. This area includes the wooded area bounded by Raceway Road on the west, 65th Street on the north, and the Eagle’s Hide-A-Way retreat on the east. The picnic area, which will include roadways, shelters and trails, is intended to skirt the edge between the open field and the wooded area.
6. **Fishing/Small Boat Launch** - This proposal will provide a small boat launch facility for fishermen. The park does not currently provide an adequate location or facility for the launching of small fishing boats. This proposal will also include space for bank fishing as well as picnicking. In addition, this area will include the staging and finishing line for the rowing course.

7. **Horse Stables** - The existing horse stables are in a state of extreme disrepair. The cost of renovating these stables is high enough to justify the construction of a new facility. Further, the present site is inappropriate for such a facility; the soils are being denuded by grazing horses, the steep slopes result in erosion problems, and there is a potential conflict with the proposed fishing/small boat launch area. Consequently, the master plan proposes to relocate new horse stables northwest of the existing. This new location is in an open field which is more suitable for pasturing/grazing.

8. **Bicycle Trail** - This proposed bicycle trail will begin on 56th Street at the interstate triangle area and surround the park proper clockwise ending at the north gate. This trail will be constructed in one of three ways: 1) a marked route along the existing road, 2) an added asphalt lane in areas of moderately heavy vehicular traffic, and 3) a separate asphalt path in areas of heavy vehicular traffic. Additionally, this trail will require the construction of a separate bicycle bridge over I-465 on 56th Street.

9. **Wildlife Observation Area** - It is proposed that this area, which lies north and east of the Water Fowl Sanctuary, should remain in its present condition with a designation stipulating no development.

10. **Preserved Area** - Since formation of the park and reservoir, a number of properties adjacent to the park have been under the authority of the Flood Board, Department of Public Works (DPW). These properties are both within the park surround and along Eagle Creek to the northeast (upstream). To date, the control of these properties has been problematic to both the Parks Department and DPW.

In order for the Parks Department to meet master plan goals, to effect proper development, and to provide proper maintenance and security, these properties should be transferred, except the dam and necessary environs, to the Department of Parks and Recreation. This will include the properties lying within the Eagle Creek Park borders between normal pool elevation and 815 feet in elevation, and also upstream of the park to 79th Street. All existing Flood Control responsibility is not to be affected. The portion of this area upstream of the park to 79th Street will be designated as a preserved area on the new plan.
11. **Living History Area** - This proposal includes the utilization of the Indian Museum and the Arts and Crafts Center. With the eventual movement of the Indian Museum exhibits to the White River State Park, this area will be open for the development of a facility with a theme depicting the evolution of living quarters of native Americans in pre-settler Indiana. In addition, this facility will include cultural aspects of this evolution such as the making of maple syrup and apple cider. Additional parking will be located near the sheriff's area with overflow parking in the meadow to the north.

12. **Swim Beach** - According to the 1979 Indiana DNR Outdoor Recreation Plan, 43% of the Indianapolis area population participates in swimming, but only 41% of that demand is being met. As was mentioned earlier, these figures are considered general in nature. But, when combined with present swim beach use levels, there results a clearly demonstrated need for additional swimming facilities. To alleviate some of this need, the master plan proposes an expansion of the existing swim beach and ancillary facilities.

13. **Rowing Course** - This proposal calls for the development of a 2000 meter regulation rowing course. This course will be made available for major regional, national, and international competitions. The course will extend from north of the swim beach toward the fishing/small boat launch area. It will be semi-permanent in nature, with the lane markers anchored on the lake bottom allowing them to be raised and lowered as needed.

14. **Community Park** - This park will not exist within the boundaries of the park proper. And, in fact, will not be considered a part of the Eagle Creek Park system. But, it does warrant discussion in this master plan due to its potential affect on the preservation of the natural character of Eagle Creek Park. As a community park, it will provide the types of facilities that are considered incompatible with the natural character of Eagle Creek Park. Consequently, any pressure to develop these types of facilities in Eagle Creek will be reduced.
CONCLUSIONS

The process undertaken to develop this master plan update has involved a wide variety of people with a wide variety of interests and concerns. Their involvement in this process has helped to insure that the recreational needs of the citizens of Indianapolis and Marion County were satisfied, and that consideration was given to the environmental concerns which pertain to the preservation of the park's natural character.

This final master plan document is representative of this involvement. The proposals contained herein were derived through a series of public meetings. These resulting proposals should benefit the interests of those concerned, the City of Indianapolis, and the public in general.

As the Eagle Creek area grows and land uses surrounding the park change, additional pressures, both in terms of recreational demand and compatibility of land uses, will be added to the park's present facilities and those facilities that are proposed in this plan. In order to insure the continued success and integrity of Eagle Creek Park, this master plan should be continuously monitored, and should be updated at regular intervals.